

### **Remarks**

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed July 2, 2007. In the Action, claims 1-52 are rejected, and claims 1, 3, 7, 27-28, 30 and 34 are objected to. The specification is amended to update the references to related applications. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-18, 27, 28, 30-32, 34, and 36-44 are amended. Claims 2 and 29 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-28, and 30-52 remain pending in the present application. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and advancement of this application to allowance.

#### **I. Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 27, and 28 are objected to because of the term “(“Items”).” This term is removed from the claims. In addition, claims 3, 7, 30, and 34 are objected to because of the parentheses included around the phrase “(directly or indirectly).” The parentheses around the phrase have been removed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections. The amendments discussed herein are not meant to limit the scope of the amended claims.

#### **II. Double Patenting Rejections**

##### **A. Claims 1 and 27 - Statutory Type Double Patenting Rejections**

Claims 1 and 27 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of co-pending Application No. 10/646,941 (hereinafter “‘941 Application”). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claim 1 of the ‘941 Application, as presented in its Amendment and Response submitted on October 22, 2007, reads as follows:

A computer-readable storage medium with computer-readable instructions for a hardware/software interface system for a computer system, wherein said hardware/software interface system manipulates a plurality of discrete units of information having properties understandable by said hardware/software interface system, Items, said Items interconnected by a plurality of Relationships managed by said hardware/software interface system, each of said Items having a boundary comprising an

item type, applicable subtype information, complex type properties and extensions if any, and a list of the other Items owned by the Item, further wherein the list of other Items owned by the Item identifies other Items the Item extends an owning relationship to, further wherein an Item that extends an owning relationship controls at least the life time of the relationship; and instructions for a hardware/software interface system to generate the owning relationship extending from a first Item to a second Item, wherein an owning relationship extending from the first Item to the second Item denotes to said hardware/software interface system that content of said second Item is publicly accessible to said first Item, and a lack of an owning relationship extending back from said second Item to said first Item denotes to said hardware/software interface system that content of said first Item is inaccessible to said second Item.

Claim 1 of the '941 Application is clearly directed to an invention that differs from those of claims 1 and 27 of the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 27 are therefore requested.

B. Claims 1-52 – Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-52 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-84, respectively, of co-pending Application '941. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution, Applicant is timely filing a Terminal Disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by D'Andrea & Janus (hereinafter D'Andrea). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

A. Claims 1 and 2

Claim 1 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium with computer-readable instructions for a file storage platform that supports organization, searching, sharing, synchronization, and security of files stored on a data store of a computer system. Claim 1 recites, in part, a core schema defining a set of core discrete units of information related to each of the discrete units of information, the system using the core schema to define: folders that organize groups of the discrete units of information, wherein one or more of the discrete units of

information belong to more than one of the folders; and categories relating to a type of one or more of the discrete units of information, the discrete units of information being automatically assigned to one or more of the categories based on the type of the discrete units of information.

One non-limiting example of such a file storage platform is shown and described in reference to Figure 4 of the present application.

In contrast, D'Andrea fails to disclose or suggest such a core schema. D'Andrea simply discloses an object relational database management system. D'Andrea fails to disclose or suggest a core schema of a file storage platform including folders and categories as recited in claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 are therefore requested.

Claim 2 is canceled. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection. In view of the cancellation, the rejection of claim 2 is now moot.

B. Claim 27

Claim 27 is directed to a method for a hardware/software interface system to manipulate a plurality of discrete units of information having properties understandable by said hardware/software interface system. Claim 27 recites, in part, that each discrete unit of information from the set of core discrete units of information is derived directly or indirectly from a common single base discrete unit of information, the common single base discrete unit of information is a foundational discrete unit of information in a Base Schema.

D'Andrea also fails to disclose or suggest these limitations. Claim 27 should therefore be allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claim 27 are respectfully requested for at least the above reasons.

C. Claim 28 and 29

Claim 28 is directed to a hardware/software interface system. Claim 28 recites, in part, a core schema defining a set of core discrete units of information related to each of the discrete units of information, the system using the core schema to define: folders that organize groups of the discrete units of information, wherein one or more of the discrete units of information belong to more than one of the folders; and categories relating to a type of one or more of the discrete units of information, the discrete units of information being automatically assigned to one or more of the categories based on the type of the discrete units of information. Claim 28 is

therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 29 is canceled. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection. In view of the cancellation, the rejection of claim 29 is now moot.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-26 and 30-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Andrea in view of Reed et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

For at least the reasons provided above, independent claims 1 and 28 are patentable. Claims 3-26 and 30-52 depend (directly or indirectly) from one of the independent claims 1 and 28. Reed et al. fails to remedy the shortcomings of D'Andrea noted above. Claims 3-26 and 30-52 are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as those provided above for claims 1 and 28. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-26 and 30-52 are therefore respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: January 2, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/  
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky  
Reg. No.: 50,471